

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the accompanying amendments and remarks. Claims 17-21 are currently pending for examination, with claims 17 and 18 being in independent form. Each of independent claims 17 and 18 has been amended herein, without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments is found throughout the specification as originally filed, for example, at [0022], [0023], [0026] and FIG. 4 or corresponding U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0015682. No new matter has been added. For the reasons provided below, the claims as presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0078708 A1) in view of a publication entitled “‘678’: The 666 of DSL Users (hereinafter referred to as “the 678 reference”) and Hammond et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0138785 A1).

Amended independent claim 17 is directed to a system for guiding a user through performance of a procedure corresponding to an uninterruptible power supply associated with the system. Specifically, the procedure comprises a method for placing the uninterruptible power supply in a *bypassing state*. The system comprises, in part, a programmed processor configured to provide one or more *correctional steps*, at least one of which is different from a displayed step, to correct an error by displaying the correctional steps to a user on a display.

Li fails to disclose, teach or suggest a method for placing the uninterruptible power supply in a *bypassing state*. As previously argued, Li et al. teach concepts associated with installing peripheral devices to a computer, such as a personal computer, and more particularly to informing the user of a discrete problem, i.e., an improper connection of a cable or the lack of a wireless connection. Furthermore, there is no teaching in Li et al. that the user is notified, after discovering an error, of “whether a *recovery* from [the] error caused by a step which is not properly performed is possible, and, if recovery is possible, to provide one or more *correctional steps*, at least one of which is different from the displayed step, to correct the error by displaying the additional steps to the user on the display.” As stated above, Li et al. simply inform the user of a failed connection. There is no teaching of providing one or more correctional steps to correct an error. The Examiner has acknowledged this in the Office Actions.

Hammond et al. teach a UPS power supply critical monitoring system having a monitoring program that listens over a network for information transmitted from the UPS. For example, the information may indicate that the UPS is in a critical state, such as a low battery, an expired battery or a loss of UPS communication with the network. There is no suggestion in Hammond et al. to provide the user with an interactive recovery system for guiding the user through performance of a procedure, let alone a procedure for placing the uninterruptable power supply in a *bypassing state* as presently recited. Hammond et al. are concerned about informing the user or the operator of a critical condition and recording the critical condition. See Hammond et al., paragraph no. [0012], for example. Hammond et al. do not teach recovery from the critical condition, much less Applicants' claimed programmed processor designed to enable the user or operator to *recover* from the critical condition by means of a guidance system as set forth in amended claim 17.

The Examiner relies on the 678 reference for teaching a method for resolving the error, and states that at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the connection guide system of Li et al. such that in the event of an unsuccessful link to an ISP, instead of displaying an error and redisplaying the same instructions as taught by Li, the system displays additional steps to resolve the error as taught by the 678 reference. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The 678 reference does not teach the provision of "one or more correctional steps, at least one of which is different from the displayed step, to correct the error by displaying the correctional steps to the user on the display" as set forth in claim 17. The Examiner relies on the following:

"Carrick said users should go to their Start Menu, select "Run," type "command" and click OK. In the new window, type "NETSH INTERFACE IP RESET LOG.TXT" and hit "Enter" (all commands should be typed without the quotes). Then restart the computer."

Applicant respectfully submits that the 678 reference does not cure the deficiencies of Li et al. and Hammond et al. Even if properly combined, which the Applicants do not concede, the combination of Li et al., the 678 reference and Hammond et al. do not disclose all of the elements of the Applicants' amended claim 17. The 678 reference would not teach a person skilled in the art to modify Li et al. to display the *correctional steps* to the user on the display. This feature is not taught by any of the references. Li et al. does not teach this claimed feature and the 678 reference is no different than an instruction manual provided for curing errors associated with any hardware

device or related software. The Examiner is reminded that Li et al. only teach displaying an error message. A person skilled in the art, with the knowledge of Li et al. and the 678 reference would not make the leap of displaying correctional steps to cure the error. Nor would the combination teach a guided procedure for placing the uninterruptable power supply in a *bypass state* as presently recited. There is simply no teaching in the references. Because no proper *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 17 is submitted as being patentable over the references of record, including Li et al., the 678 reference and Hammond et al.

As discussed above with reference to claim 17, amended independent claim 18 is submitted as being patentable for the same reasons given for claim 17.

Claims 19-21, which depend from claim 18, are submitted as being patentable for the same reasons provided for claim 18.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the application is believed to be in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Nicole A. Palmer/
Keith F. Noe, Reg. No. 34,686
Nicole A. Palmer, Reg. No. 58,943
LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
Riverfront Office Park
One Main Street
Cambridge, MA 02142
Tel.: (617) 395-7039
Fax: (617) 395-7070
Attorney for Applicants